

Remarks/Arguments:

In the Office Action dated June 28, 2005, the Examiner asserted a restriction requirement between apparatus claims 1-22 and 31-36 and method claims 23-30. The Applicant hereby elects without traverse the apparatus claims 1-22 and 31-36 for examination in this application. Non-elected claims 23-30 remain in the application, but are hereby withdrawn without being canceled.

Further in that Office Action, the Examiner asserted a species election between four species, drawn respectively to Figures 10A, 10B, 10C, and 13. The Applicant provisionally elects the species of Figure 13 with traverse, to which at least claims 1-7, 10-18, 21-22, and 31-36 read upon. Each of those claims are seen to be generic to the species of Figures 10A, 10B, and 13; and claims 1-6, 10-17, and 31-36 are seen to be generic to the species of each of Figures 10A, 10B, 10C and 13.


The Applicant further contests the species election. As recited at page 7, lines 4-6 and 15-17, Figures 10A-C show top views of the shield metallization whereas Figure 13 is a cross-sectional view of the integrated circuit to which the grounded electrical shield is only a part. The only *claimed* distinction seen between the cited Figures is whether the ground connection A is at the center of the shield 20 as in Figures 10A-B (page 8 line 24 and page 9 line 2; claims 7 and 18) or external to the shield as in Figure 10C (page 9, lines 3-4, not explicitly claimed). The text describing Figure 13 does not recite that the via 29 for connecting the shield 20 to the desired ground potential is at the center of the shield, and the cross-sectional view of Figure 13 does not limit Figure 13 to that embodiment, but the Applicant assumes that is how the Examiner characterizes Figure 13 for purposes of species distinctions, and grouped the species claims above accordingly. Other claim elements such as ribbon width, ribbon spacing, and composition of the layers is not distinguished as between Figures 10A-C and 13. Each of Figures 10A-C show ribbons that enable minimization of eddy currents because the ribbons do not loop (page 8, lines 25-28). Under the presumption that Figure 13 is a separate species from those of Figures 10A-C, the cross sectional view of Figure 13 is not limited to either looped or non-looping ribbons.

The Applicant withdrew claims 8-9 and 19-20 because the elected species of Figure 13 does not explicitly show four layers. However, withdrawal of those claims does not imply that the

elected claims exclude the addition of a fourth layer, such as the fourth layer recited in those withdrawn claims.

Applicant respectfully requests examination of the elected claims on the merits. The undersigned welcomes the opportunity to resolve or clarify any remaining matters via teleconference, at the Examiner's discretion.

Respectfully submitted:


Gerald J. Stanton
Reg. No.: 46,008

July 28, 2005
Date

Customer No.: 29683
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP
4 Research Drive
Shelton, CT 06484-6212
Phone: (203) 925-9400
Facsimile: (203) 944-0245
Email: gstanton@hspatent.com

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.

July 28, 2005
Date


Name of Person Making Deposit